



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/925,343

08/09/2001

Gerd Jakob Ernst Scheller

853663.408

4400

38106

7590

03/17/2010

SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC
701 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 5400
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER

ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/17/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/925,343	Applicant(s) SCHELLER ET AL.	
	Examiner MD S. ELAHEE	Art Unit 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 11/19/2009. Claims 1 and 3-15 are pending. Claim 2 has been previously cancelled. Claims 14 and 15 have been newly added.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/19/2009 Remarks have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following:

Regarding claim 1, the applicant argues on pages 9-11 that Nakamura and Donnelly, alone or in combination, thus fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the structural relationship of a battery compartment lid being both integrally arranged or embedded in a wall of a housing and being a lever element that bends a bottle cap by way of a leverage effect. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Nakamura teaches housing of the battery compartment (see fig.1) whereas Donnelly teaches battery compartment lid and the belt clip [i.e., lever element] attached to the lid arranged to bend a material of lower hardness, external to the portable electronic apparatus, by way of a leverage effect, wherein the material of lower hardness includes a bottle cap (fig.1-10; col.5, lines 12-18, 44-67, col.6, lines 1-22, 58-67). Thus Nakamura and Donnelly in combination teach the claimed limitations.

Thus, the rejection of the claim will remain. The rejection of the claims 6 and 7 will remain for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Nakamura** et al. (U.S. 6,529,714) and in view of **Donnelly** (U.S. 5,531,365).

Regarding claims 1 and 6, **Nakamura** teaches a radio communication equipment [i.e., portable electronic mobile phone apparatus] comprising:

a housing having a wall and an opening to a battery compartment (fig.1);

a battery pack positioned in the battery compartment (fig.1); and

a battery compartment lid that is integrally arranged in the wall of the housing and is arranged to cover at least partly the battery pack and the battery compartment, said battery compartment being a lever element (abstract; fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 54-65).

However, **Nakamura** does not specifically teach battery compartment lid being a lever element that is arranged to bend a material of lower hardness, external to the portable electronic apparatus, by way of a leverage effect, wherein the material of lower hardness includes a bottle cap. **Donnelly** teaches battery compartment lid and the belt clip [i.e., lever element] attached to the lid is arranged to bend a material of lower hardness, external to the portable electronic apparatus, by way of a leverage effect, wherein the material of lower hardness includes a bottle cap (fig.1-10; col.5, lines 12-18, 44-67, col.6, lines 1-22, 58-67). Further, according to **In re Larson** 144 U.S.P.Q. 347, when parts are rigidly secured together as a single unit, they function as a unitary whole. Further it would be obvious to integrate the belt clip [i.e., lever element] into the battery compartment lid and so that users are not required to have a separate element to open/remove a bottle cap.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Nakamura** to incorporate the lever element being arranged to bend a material of lower hardness, external to the portable electronic apparatus, by way of a

Art Unit: 2614

leverage effect, wherein the material of lower hardness includes a bottle cap in **Nakamura's** invention as taught by **Donnelly**. The motivation for the modification is to do so in order to provide a battery compartment lid integrating a bottle cap opener such that a user can enjoy the benefit of using the battery compartment lid for multipurpose use.

Claims 5, 9, 12 and 14 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, **Nakamura** teaches that the lever element is constructed as an angled metal plate having an edge with an angle (fig.1; col.2, lines 54-65).

Claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, **Nakamura** teaches a synthetic material structure having a wall and an opening for exposing a battery pack of a mobile telephone (fig.1); and

a battery compartment lid which offers inherently protection against shocks and pressure (abstract; fig.1, 2; col.1, line 66, col.2, line 7, col.2, lines 54-65, col.3, lines 23-29, 48-54).

Regarding claims 10 and 13, **Nakamura** teaches a connection unit for connecting the battery pack to a charging apparatus, wherein the battery compartment lid covers the connection unit (fig.1; col.1, line 66-col.2, line 7).

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Nakamura et al.** in view of **Donnelly** further in view of **Fuchs et al.** (U.S. 3,870,184).

Regarding claim 3, **Nakamura** teaches the lever element is arranged to inherently open battery storage recess [i.e., closures] and is connected to the housing (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 54-65, col.4, lines 19-24, 32-39).

However, **Nakamura** in view of **Donnelly** fails to teach metal closures. Fuchs teaches metal closures (abstract; col.1, lines 60, 61). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Nakamura** in view of **Donnelly** to allow metal closures as taught by **Fuchs**. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to increase the hoop strength.

8. Claims 4, 8, 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Nakamura** et al. in view of **Donnelly** further in view of **Savovic** et al. (U.S. 5,260,146).

Regarding claims 4, 8, 11, **Nakamura** in view of **Donnelly** fails to teach that the lever element is made of metal and/or ceramic. **Savovic** teaches that the lid [i.e., lever element] is made of metal and/or ceramic (col.3, line 8). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Nakamura** in view of **Donnelly** to allow the lever element being made of metal and/or ceramic as taught by **Savovic**. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to connect the anode to the positive terminal.

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 8. Furthermore, **Nakamura** teaches that most of the telephone housing is non-metal (fig.1).

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MD S. ELAHEE whose telephone number is (571)272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, FAN TSANG can be reached on (571)272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/MD S ELAHEE/
MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2614
March 17, 2010